

APPOINTED PROTECTIONS, THE SUPPORT AND USE OF A GUARDIAN

Dear Prosecution, the Courts, The Department of Justice and associated administration,

We write to you in concern for our client, namely that of the attached overview, and our previous correspondence in relation to their treatment to date, which is further compounded by almost a complete lack of communication and/or even response from yourselves, or even basic acknowledgement thereof, of most recent, being that of the prosecution.

In light of recent correspondence, namely that from the prosecution, whereby they claimed to the effect that they will not enter into or entertain discussion surrounding the case with those other than whom are “legally appointed” to do so, and/or also based primarily on your own appointed criteria.

We would like to bring to the attention of the prosecution and the courts, that this criteria limits and even outright excludes and/or prevents certain organisations or individuals wishing to come to the aid and assistance of vulnerable persons such as my client, and therefor excluding, inhibiting, restricting and also therefor potentially also discriminating against the employ of such protective mechanisms, and suffice to say attempts to subjugate the subsequent legal, common law and human rights thereof of the aforementioned effected parties.

We also put to your administration that such criteria set out by the courts, have been established in such a way so as to prevent any anonymous support structures, thus in doing so, your administration not only fails to protect those wishing to speak up against treatment from the system, but also aims to in fact potential expose and also leave these supporting structures vulnerable to certain influences, including but not limited to that of criminal conduct and any associated intimidation, harassment and coercion, including that exercised by your own administration.

We hereby put to the courts, the prosecution and the Justice System, that your administration not only conducts itself in such a way that severely disadvantages this entire aforementioned demographic, being vulnerable persons, but does so in a way that is egregious and also potentially exploits this vulnerability in order to aid not only the prosecution but also that of expediting and/or securing a conviction.

One only need to examine the nature of the mental health courts and associated processes, including the treatment of those with mental illness and that of vulnerable persons to see clear evidence of this, being namely that of the reversal of guilt and that of the way evidence is processed, of which both actively and knowingly subjugate fair judicial process.

Suffice to say, our organisation has been formed, as a means of providing a level of support, not currently on offer and/or available, being that of the following:

- [] An anonymous support network: A network that is protected from outside influence and intimidation, be it by that of corporate, government bodies, entities or individuals.
- [] An organisation that insulates itself against egregious, unjust and criminal processes.
- [] An impartial service: A service whereby we are not funded, nor under the auspice, nor regulatory restrictions of a funding body or government, usually aimed at inhibiting certain levels of service.
- [] Scope of support: Our network comprises of Legal practitioners, GP's, psychologists, psychiatrists, IT Specialists, politicians and a wide range of service providers.

As you are well aware, all of the current government “support networks”, that pertain to aid in the support and namely that of fair judicial procedure, are either suspected of or are being influenced, coerced, intimidated and/or corrupted, if at the very least indirectly through association with those funding bodies, including but not limited to, services such as legal aid and mental health services.

Suffice to say, we cannot help but in deed question as to why an architecture or format doesn’t already exist, that addresses the aforementioned vulnerabilities, even as far as your administration still not adequately protecting those within your own framework from such influences, including the aforementioned intimidation, coercion and an/or harassment, especially when it comes to influencing key judicial processes and/or securing a conviction!

We also note that the prosecution will not enter into discussion with anyone other than the individual in question, in relation to this case, that does not meet their desired criteria. In response to this, we can only say, that given as a direct result of what our client has suffered at the hands of the justice system and associated administrative process, which has actually further worsened their current position. Our client was already operating in a diminished capacity, and thus somewhat disadvantaged, and in light of any available support, have thus called on that of ourselves, yet it seems clear that you also seem to want to inhibit and also prevent even this level of assistance.

Further to this we have been instructed that the prosecution will however enter into discussion regarding the case, and/or associated content that forms part of the public record, or is public knowledge, it is for this reason, and out of the common law right of necessity and in the protection of our client and the witnesses that we have chosen to elect and/or nominated to have published here said information, including but not limited to the brief of evidence and where relevant any associated correspondence with the courts, prosecution and associated administration.

We would also like to again formally request the immediate review and subsequent redaction, of any laws, provisions and/or acts that contravene, or pro-port to take away the underlying rights, being that of common law and human rights and in the broader context international protections being that they are in fact deemed null and void and thus unenforceable, and only serve to either confuse and or intimidate the general public, let alone those of a vulnerable disposition, we primarily refer to the right to self medicate and the associated cannabis laws.

We also feel that we are at the very least also entitled to a response, highlighting not only your intentions, but also the means and methods in which you plan to address these aforementioned concerns, namely that surrounding the injustices experienced by our client and the associated demographic, being that of those suffering from mental illness and those being deemed as vulnerable persons, at the hands of your administration, being first and foremost our clients current predicament.

We feel we need to re-iterate that at the very least, you do us, being ourselves and our client the basic courtesy, whereby at the very least you acknowledge the correspondence received to date, other than that of an automated response.

Kind Regards,

Guardian